

Group cohesion differentials among low and high achievers of men volleyball players

Received 07th June 2017,
Accepted 18th June 2017

K. Usha Rani^{a,*}

www.ijpefs.com

DOI: 10.26524/2017.06.02.6

^aDepartment of physical Education & Health Sciences, Alagappa University, Karaikudi, Tamilnadu, India.

*Corresponding Author Ph: +91 82207 78095; Email: dr.k.usharani@gmail.com

Abstract: The purpose of the study was to find out the group cohesion differential among low and high achievers of men volleyball players. The purpose of the study was to compare the group cohesion among senior state level Men Volley ball players. To achieve this purpose of the study forty-eight volleyball players selected as low achievers from income tax, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Tuticorin and Central Excise and forty eight volleyball players, selected as high achievers from Indian Overseas Bank, Indian Bank, State Bank and Integral Coach Factory. The subjects were aged between twenty to thirty five years. The investigator distributed group environment questionnaire to measure the group cohesion among the players. Conclusion: There was a significant difference in team involvement between low and high achievers of senior state level men volleyball players. There was no significant difference in personal involvement between low and high achievers of senior state level men volleyball players. There was a significant difference in personal involvement and team involvement among low achievers. There was a significant difference in personal involvement and team involvement among high achievers. There was a significant difference in group cohesion between low and high achievers among senior state level volleyball players, with high achievers indicating better cohesion.

Keywords: Group cohesion, Low achievers, High achievers, Volley ball players.

Introduction

Physical education is playing an important part in achieving these objectives. As a result of such contributions as the benefits of exercise to physical health, the fundamental physical skills that make for a more interesting, efficient and vigorous life, and the social education that contributes to the development of character and good human relations, these cardinal principles are brought nearer to realization. In the field of physical education the sciences of anatomy, physiology and psychology for example provide principles regarding the development stage of vital organs and the laws of learning [1-2].

The study of psychology has implication for Physical Educators in such areas as learning theory, motor development, motor development, motor control, motor learning and psychology of sport. The word psychology comes from the Greek words, meaning mind or soul, and yoga meaning science. Psychology is the sciences of the mind and the soul. Psychologists study human nature scientifically and rather than formulate conclusions from casual observations they sort and check and recheck human characteristic under reliable conditions.

Psychology considers different types named as

- i.) Social Psychology
- ii.) Educational Psychology of Sports,
- iii.) Development Psychology
- iv.) Clinical Psychology
- v.) Sports Psychology

Sports psychology is unfolding the behaviour of a sportsman. It tries the study abstract invisible mind through concrete behaviour high excellence or sports performance is also human behaviour. As Psychology deals with human needs, motives, interest, attitudes, social relation. Sports psychology too deals with athletes behaviour in particular reflected through various sports action and activities in being studied with the help of sports psychology. Sports psychology uses basic principles of psychology but with the fine blend of sports sciences and physical performance. Most of the psychological principles of learning are used in sports learning too, certain emotional, education intellectual maturity, is highly essential for learning academic contents, so is the care with sports learning. Some specific activities need certain level of physical maturity of bones, joints,

muscles respiratory capacity. To bring up the mind in an alternative mental state at the time of particular performance requires previous mental training.

Methodology

To achieve these purpose 48 men volleyball players were selected. The subjects were selected form senior state level volley ball tournament, which was held at Ooty on 21st to 27th September. The state team was selected from that tournament. The team which defeated in the Quarter final was selected as low achievers; the teams are following Income tax, Tuticorin, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board (TNEB) and Central Excise. The teams which enter and defeated in the semi finals are Integral Coach Factory (ICF) and State Bank and the teams which enter in the finals are, Indian Overseas Bank and Indian Bank were selected as high achievers. These players were represented for India and Tamil Nadu State. The subjects were get their job based on their performance.

Selection of Tool for Measurement

The study was an attempt to find out the comparison in Group cohesion among low and high achievers of Men Volley ball players. In order to achieve this purpose and to facilitate this study the investigator made a survey based on group environment questionnaire. The group environment questionnaire was based on conceptual model of cohesion. This questionnaire was framed by Wedmeyer et.al [3-5]. It was measure the perception of active group members and part literature on group dynamics. It consists of 18 times. The group environment questionnaire was used to find out the group cohesion among the players. It is more reliable, easy to understand, and to measure the correct adequate data. It was easy to administer the players.

The questionnaire responded by the subjects were recorded carefully. The collected scores from the responses were subjected to statistical analysis to find out mean, standard deviation, standard error, degrees of freedom and t-ratio to find the significant difference if any, between low and high achievers among senior state level men volleyball players.

Table 1.Table shows the means, difference between means standard deviation, standard error of the means, standard error of the difference between means and t-ratio for the scores for low and high achievers in personal involvement in group cohesion among senior state level men volleyball players.

Groups	Means	Difference between means	Standard deviation	Standard error of the means	Standard error of the Difference between mean	't' ratio
Low Achievers	52.79	2.17	10.20	1.47	2.52	0.86
High Achievers	54.96		14.20	2.05		

DF= N1 + N2 [48=48-2]=94,Table Value = 1.99, *No Significant at 0.05 level of Confidence

Discussion on Findings

Table 1 shows the means, standard deviation, standard error of the means, standard error of the difference between the means, Degrees of Freedom and't' ratio computed from the scores in personal involvement for low and high achievers in group cohesion among senior state level men volleyball players.

The obtained't' ratio was 0.86 and the required table for the degrees of freedom (69-2=94) Ninety four at 0.5 level of confidence was 1.99 as

indicated by Clarke and Clarke. Since the obtained 't; ratio of 0.86 was less than the t-value of 1.99 for the degree of freedom of 94 at 0.5 level of confidence, there was no significant difference between low and high achievers of senior state level men volleyball players in personal involvement. Hence the hypothesis was rejected at .05 level of confidence and there was no significant difference between low and high achievers of senior state level men volleyball players in personal involvement.

Table 2. Shows the means, difference between means standard deviation, standard error of the means, and standard error of the difference between means and t-ratio for the scores for low and high achievers in personal involvement in group cohesion among senior state level men volleyball players.

Groups	Means	Difference between means	Standard deviation	Standard error of the means	Standard error of the Difference between mean	't' ratio
Low Achievers	47.42	5.08	12.38	1.79	2.23	2.29
High Achievers	52.5		9.20	1.33		

Table Value = 1.99, *Significant at 0.05 level of Confidence.

Discussion on Findings

The Table shows the means difference between the means standard deviation, standard error of the means, standard error of the difference between the mean and 't' ratio computed from the scores in personal involvement for low and high achievers in group cohesion among senior state level men volleyball players.

The obtained 't' ratio was 2.29 and required 't' value for the degree of freedom 94 at 0.05 level of

confidence was 1.99 as indicated by Clarke and Clarke since the obtained 't' ratio of 2.29 was more than the 't' value of 1.99 for the degree of freedom of ninety four at 0.05 level of confidence, there was significant difference between low and high achievers of senior state level men volleyball players in personal involvement. Hence the hypotheses were accepted.

Table 3. Shows the means, difference between means standard deviation, standard error of the means, standard error of the difference between means and t-ratio for the scores between personal involvement and team involvement in group cohesion for low and high achievers.

Groups	Means	Difference between means	Standard deviation	Standard error of the means	Standard error of the Difference between mean	't' ratio
Low Achievers						
Personal Involvement	P.52.79	5.37	P.10.20	P.1.47	2.31	2.32
Team Involvement	T.47.42		T.12.38	T.1.79		
High Achievers						
Personal Involvement	P.54.96	7.54	P.14.05	P.2.05	2.44	3.09
Team Involvement	T.52.5		T.9.20	T.1.33		

Table Value = 1.99, *Significant at 0.05 level of Confidence

Discussion on Findings

Table shows the means, difference between the means standard deviation, standard error of the means, standard error of the difference between the means and 't' ratio computed from the low and high achievers, scores between personal involvement and

team involvement among senior state level men volleyball players.

The obtained 't' ratio was 2.32 for low achievers in personal involvement and team involvement and the required 't' value for the degrees of freedom (96-2=94) Ninety four at 0.05 level of confidence was 1.99. Since the 't' ratio of 2.32 was

more than table value. Hence the hypothesis was accepted.

The obtained 't' ratio was 3.09 for high achievers in personal and team involvement and there required 't' ratio for the degrees of confidence was 1.99. Since the 't' ratio of 3.09 was more than the t-value. Hence the hypothesis was accepted.

Conclusion

There was a significant difference in team involvement between low and high achievers of Group cohesion among senior state level men volleyball players. There was no significant difference in personal involvement between low and high achievers of group cohesion among senior state level men volleyball players. There was a significant difference in personal involvement and team involvement among low achievers. There was a significant difference in personal involvement and team involvement among high achievers. There was significant difference in group cohesion between low and high achievers among senior state level volleyball players with high achievers indicating better cohesion.

References

1. J.C.Aggarwal, Educational Research New Delhi: Arya Book Depot, 1975
2. V.Albert, Carron Group Dynamics in Sport. London: Spodym Publications, 1988
3. P.I.A.Babu, Comparative study of performance of Agentive the world cup winner and other countries in selected matches of world cup soccer championship 1986.
4. Clarke, H.David and H.Harrison Clarke, Research Process in Physical Education, Recreation and Health. Englewood cliffs, New Jersey: Preutice Hall Inc., 1989.
5. Deborah, A. West and A. Bucher Charles Foundation of Physical Education and Sport. Mosby Company Publication, 1975.